CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXIII Nos. 2 and 3 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* February/March, 1982.

CONCORD NOT CONCORDE

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

Readers of this journal know that *Candour* was founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 for the specific purpose of fearlessly combatting the machinations of the manipulators of International Finance. This, he and we did and have continued to do to the best of our ability for nearly thirty years, and *still* we are, as it were, floundering across the mud of no man's land, whilst those who should be with us arrange social diversions in the rear areas. The enemy ensconced on the educational, economic and political fronts occupied so long ago appear invulnerably dominant; even on the religious front, potentially outflanking bishops have been captured along with their flocks. Some have changed sides, others are immobilised. It is a dreary picture to our eyes, so let us consider instead what we ourselves can do to change the scene. Recent issues of *Candour* have indicated definite action to be taken, but perhaps we shall be more instantly motivated if we can but view what transformation we might expect to accomplish.

Debt, Poverty And Slavery

It is all in a succinct little book named *The Guernsey Experiment,* first published in the U.S.A. in 1960, that I have lately been re-reading. As the introduction says, "We have achieved the mastery of the Earth by taming the elements, we have provided ourselves with mechanical robots, but we continue to endure poverty and slavery." As we, too, are well aware, "the whole nation flounders in debt, to the tune of untold millions." But, as the booklet's authors go on to say, "this debt is only the reflection of our riches; the money loaned would be valueless without a backing of goods and services." So, "surely we could devise a system whereby money could be issued as required without having to resort to debt or usury?"

Well, of course we could. But as John Mitchell has been pointing out lately, we have to force our politicians and economists to admit it. At odd times it has been done in Austria and Bavaria, and schemes suggested for Alberta and Glasgow. Wörgl in Austria and Swanenkirchen in Bavaria were once converted from poverty-ridden to prosperous communities by the issue of debt-free locally created money, but were then forcibly prevented from issuing any further free money by their respective bank-controlled governments. Alberta's Social Credit bid for economic freedom was strangled at birth by Ottawa, and the Glasgow "rates voucher scheme", of which more later, remains a dream. The awesome power of the Banksters is made manifest.

However, there is Guernsey to give us hope. Early in the nineteenth century, after twenty years of Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, this small neglected island had nothing to recommend it except its scenic beauty and pleasant climate. Its roads, dykes, market-place and public transport were all either in dire disrepair or non-existent. Far from attracting visitors for pleasure, it repelled even its inhabitants, especially as it was fast falling victim to the encroaching sea. Vast sums would be required just to save the island from being washed away, let alone to make it attractive to live and work on, yet its total net income was a mere £600 a year.

The Guernsey States already carried a Debt of £19,137 which bore an annual interest charge of £2,390; hence the miserable £600 change from a gross income of £3,000. What to do? The dyke project alone was estimated at £10,000; no more taxes could be wrung from the impoverished people; more debt could be nothing less than unrepayable — the members of the Committee appointed to examine the problem were obviously not yet conditioned to accept unrepayable debt as a way of life: rather, they regarded such a contingency as a way of death — therefore, they recommended issue of States notes of £1 sterling to the value of £6,000 to finance the most essential public works. That was in 1816, when bankers' notes to the face value of £50,000 were in circulation. But Banksters have never lacked percipience. One can imagine the pressure being applied at tactical points, and admire the undoubted integrity of the majority of that States Committee, for it was not until late in 1816 that the first issue of States notes to the value of £4,000 was authorised for coastal preservation. They were subject to redemption in three stages from April 1817 to April 1818 and not for re-issue. Thus, when the works undertaken were completed, not only was the States Debt not increased, but sufficient money was left in the Exchequer for other needs.

From this time on, the Banksters fought tooth and nail to preserve their Debt system intact. Only after three more years did the already demonstrated advantage of Credit finance win the day. In 1820, £4,500 in States notes were issued, redeemable in ten years from import duties and such. In 1921, £10,000 of States notes were Guernsey's favoured currency. Debt-free finance had transformed the island from a derelict piece of land in danger of submersion by either the natural ocean or by the *un*natural sea of unrepayable debt, into a prosperous community with all necessary public and building works established and in good repair, with flourishing trade and satisfied tourists — all without a penny more in interest charges.

Age-Old Weapons

No wonder the Banksters fought back with their age-old weapons. In 1826, "certain persons" (no prizes for guessing who they were) "made representations to the Privy Council, and laid complaints that the States had no right to exceed their annual income without Royal consent." The explanation demanded from and supplied by the States Finance Committee was so unanswerable that "the matter was closed". Next, the two private banks in Guernsey founded (significantly) in 1827 and 1830 respectively, flooded the island with paper money. Now comes the interesting and — alas — familiar bit. The States, fearing their own notes would be prejudiced if the phoney flood continued, appointed a Committee "to confer with the banks" or, perhaps we should say, enter into "dialogue" with the enemy. The ensuring "detente" resulted in the *States* withdrawing £15,000 of their interest-free notes from circulation and agreeing to limit further issue to £40,000, whilst the worse-than-worthless interest-bearing I.O.U.s flowed out unrestricted. This state of affairs prevailed for the next seventy years. It appears the Banksters were prepared to let sleeping credit lie.

Then came the Great War, and Guernsey was freed by a for-once happy irony. The very Banksters who financed the holocaust curtailed the issue of their own paper money to "no more than the amount already in circulation"! The States, being under no such obligation, happily issued their own credit as required, and has never looked back since. Guernsey enjoys "low prices, plenty of money and a high standard of living" whilst the monetarist debt-ridden rest of Britain is still paying for the Battle of Waterloo!

But it is plain that if we hope ever to extricate ourselves from our enduring parlous state, it is no use to think *we* can extract any good out of the evils of war. By 1939, the Banksters had learned their lesson — let Debt be unconfined in every circumstance is the motto. They merely shift the burden about as anyone knows who has followed the vagaries of the "Polish crisis". Come the reckoning, they have even remembered to demand both flesh *and* blood in the pound, no Portia come forward to get around *that.*

With Guernsey's common sense to help us rebuild a war-ravaged world, we might still have a well-governed Empire and a Royal Navy to protect it; we might have avoided starvation, massacre and mayhem in those imperial remnants now known as the Third World; we would certainly have refused any longer to foster so evil a system as Communism or institute so disastrous establishments as the Welfare State and the Common Market. The Comet, TSR-2, hovercraft, jump-jets and nuclear power, to name but a few of the original products of our native genius, might have been produced and improved in an industrious, prosperous Great Britain instead of being scrapped, stolen, abandoned or sold for a song to competitors at the hands of successive debt-driven, Bank-patronised governments.

Since national government is now so given over to treason in pursuance of Bank-sterdom's One World, and princes and prelates are baying in unison like the hounds of Hell on the same aecumenical scent, perhaps we should exercise our persuasions on lower echelons of authority.

The Glasgow rates voucher scheme, mentioned earlier, was the brain-child of J. K. Grubiak, co-author of *The Guernsey Experiment.* It concerned the conversion into interest-free legal tender of the £1 rates vouchers already issued for the advance payment of rates. All that is required to increase the topicality of this scheme is to extend it to the payment of electricity and gas bills, television licences, oil, fuel, coal . . . Think of all those cards covered in £1 stamps for the payment (in advance) of this, that and the other. Most of us are already paying in advance for some service or commodity which some unforeseen disaster may even prevent us from enjoying. If those stamps and vouchers were issued as legal tender, we could pay or part-pay everyone from the home-help to the Collector of Taxes with them.

What better time than now to use this scheme to refute the mouthings of Thatcher, Foot, Heseltine, Jenkins, Steele and Company on monetarism or debtism with the commonsense action so irrefutably successful that it has never been mentioned where any but the minimum audience can learn from it.

As always, it is the patriot's task to do everything in his little power to enlarge that audience until no parliamentarian or councillor can admit ignorance

without proclaiming him or herself an incompetent ignoramus unfitted for any position of authority. Cumulative force can smash the largest suspension bridge; persistently applied, it could also make short work of shattering party hacks.

Try it and see.

LIVERPOOL NEWSLETTER

Edited quarterly by Anthony Cooney.
Sample copy 35p.
Rose Cottage, 17 Hadassah Grove,
Liverpool L17 8XH.

SUPPORT JOE PEARCE

No British patriot, whatever organisation he supports, can fail to be angered by the six-month prison sentence imposed on Joe Pearce, Editor of the National Front's youth newspaper, *Bulldog*.

Joe's trial at the Old Bailey exposed the hypocrisy of British "justice". It was the *third* he had had to face on the same set of trumped-up charges under the Race Relations Act — the legislation which tries to make it illegal to oppose coloured immigration and treats Whites as second-class citizens in their own country. On the first two occasions, no verdicts were reached and the juries discharged. However, so anxious were our Home Secretary, the oaf Whitelaw, and D.P.P., "Sir" Thomas Hetherington, to secure Joe's conviction, that he was forced to face a third, and fateful, ordeal. Indeed, the last trial was "expedited" in order to ensure he would return to the dock in a matter of weeks rather than months. The immigrant and Jewish lobbies were exulted.

Joe was first summonsed in March of last year. Wishing to avoid being seen in the role of bully-boys, the Attorney-General's office waited until a month after he ceased to be a teenager before acting. The relentless way in which he was persecuted from then on stands in stark comparison to the treatment of four Blacks who allegedly were the leaders of the Bristol riots in April 1980. In a similar "hung jury" trial, the Attorney-General, "Sir" Michael Havers, ruled that they should be freed "in the interests of good race relations". The harsh sentence meted out by Judge Peter Mason (the surname is probably most apt) suggests that the legal establishment is more keen on curbing the frank comments of a decent young Briton uttered in defence of his race and nation than the assault and mutilation of young girls by psychopathic rapists.

Candour's Editor and staff are delighted to hear from one reader that Joe is in good spirits despite his incarceration. However, we urge *every single subscriber* to send a message of support to him, addressed as follows: M71751 Pearce, H.M. Prison, Springfield Road, Chelmsford, Essex.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Save the whale, the chimpanzee,
The hungry hunter shunned,
Subsidise most generously
The World Wild Life Fund.

Save the seals, which eat the fish —
Save the fishes too;
It seems to be nobody's wish
To save the kangaroo.

Include the hippopotamus
'Though who could really care
To claim for pet — or carcass —
They kill it 'cause it's there.

Not so the horny rhino
Whose powdered proboscis
Gives rise to Eastern kowtow
For zest to Chinese kiss!

Save the eagle, avocet,
Even pleas for butterfly,
Bluebell and the wild violet;
Preserving quite the smallest fry.

Nature lovers on their knees
Pray for the environment
But can't see man, alas for fleas;
Thus, multi-race experiment.

The English with their great concern
For fish and fowl and furry beast
Seemingly will never learn
That they themselves are not the least.

And so chaotic melting pot —
A phrase from Hell, a parrot cry —
Will boil to international plot
'Til truth unmasks the One World lie.

B. E. BIGGS.

"Your slendour volume is a rapier of the finest tempered steel — the deadly point of thought and word thrusts home every time."

Thus wrote one delighted reader to B. E. Biggs on receipt of 'Open Sesame', our recently-published anthology of his poems.

Have you bought YOUR copy yet? If not, simply send £1 for one to Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

AN EVIL WE CAN DO WITHOUT

Priests who dabble in politics are generally a sickening band who notoriously seem to prefer every race, nation or culture to their own. Their faces are usually sufficient to betray their leanings, serving as perfect illustrations of, and unconscious comment on, the simple-minded drivel they espouse. I have no idea what the members of the Roman Catholic Commission for Racial Justice look like, but I can guess having just read in the press of their call for churches to let their premises be used for "services" by Rastafarians. This bizarre cult worships the tin-pot Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia and believes that Christ was Negro! It also allows its followers to get "high" on cannabis as part of their "religious" ritual. The Commission's president, Bishop McCartie, argued that cannabis-smoking could "create problems" when letting premises as "there are obvious things in [Rastafarianism] which are not acceptable *at the moment* [my italics] in this country because of the law." However, he realised the Rastas looked on drug-taking as "an equivalent to the Christian Communion Service," while Richard Zipfel (I bet *his* folks didn't hail from the Emerald Isle), the Commission's secretary, observed that a similar problem had arisen in the U.S.A. with communion wine during the prohibition of alcohol!

Eye-Witness Account

Light was shed on the activities of the Rastafarians in their native West Indies in a letter to the *Daily Mail* on January 22nd. from Mrs. Ivy Reid, a journalist who had been attached to the *Daily Gleaner* between 1957 and 1974. She had covered political, social and health matters in Jamaica and often went into the Rastas' shanty towns. Also, she went behind the walls of the compound for criminally insane males in Bellevue, Jamaica's vast mental hospital, where no reporters had been before.

What she had observed of the Rastafarians made her "physically sick," she said. Those who "merely used the religion have had a terrible reputation in Jamaica for many decades," her letter ran. "Jamaican police and/or prison officers deal harshly with the Rastas who kill as many black policemen as they can. In Jamaica's General Penitentiary or Spanish Town Prison, they do not keep their dreadlocks but are shaved. Decent Jamaicans — white, coloured or black — fear and loathe 'bad' Rastas. The very large percentage of manic Rastas held in the mental hospital (population over 5,000) are there because the combination of marijuana, white rum and V.D. put them there. U.K. do-gooders should visit Bellevue before allowing bad Rastas to corrupt our social life and place additional burdens on the shoulders of our medical services. Of course, there are good, clean, industrious and sincere Rastafarians . . . [But] bad Rasta gangs — joining with Marxist students of the University of the West Indies campus at Mona — carried out bloody and fatal riots in Kingston. Their first targets were always the Asian and Chinese small shop-keepers — then their own decent blacks — then the whites. One must evaluate the Rasta history in Jamaica first before setting decisions in the U.K."

An article in *The Spectator* on January 16th. by Richard West underlined these unwelcome aspects of Rastafarianism. He claimed that lobbyists for the cult "seem to be ignorant of the revulsion against the Rastas throughout the West Indies and even among most Jamaicans. They get understanding but not any sympathy in islands like Trinidad and Barbados, where Rastarianism is seen as a dangerous pestilence." The Rastas' refusal to work, he said, "makes them unpopular. Their habit of smoking and dealing in drugs brings them constantly into fights with the law, which forbids these everywhere in the Caribbean. It is more than twenty years since the Jamaican Rastas started to put into practice their slogan of 'Death to the Whites' — by which they include browns, yellows and any blacks considered loyal to 'Babylon'.,, These, presumably, are the Niyamen, a grotesque extreme of the Rastafarian movement which swears an oath of "Death to the White oppressors and their Black allies".

We can only assume that the members of the Catholic Commission for Racial Justice are somewhat deficient in their supposed specialist knowledge of West Indian affairs. So far from it being the case that Rastafarian morality "does not differ substantially from Christian teaching . . . the Ten Commandments are known and accepted, as are the two great commandments — love of God and love of neighbour", they are extending a welcoming hand to a movement that is, as Bernard Smith of the Christian Affirmation Campaign commented in *Candour* eighteen months ago, "violently anti-White, anti-social, anti-Christian . . . whose continued presence in this country can only foster negative and alien attitudes."

"The real weakness of England lies simply in the fact that her ideals are emotional, not intellectual" — Oscar Wilde. British Nationalist Think Tank Leaflet 1 available from Albert Elder, Flat 1, Gannet House, 6 Hartington Place, Eastbourne, Sussex.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW ON APARTHEID

What follows is the text of a statement, in question-and-answer form, issued, we think, in 1964 by the Roman Archbishop of Bloemfontein, the late Archbishop W. P. Whelan, O.M.I. His answers reveal a refreshingly honest and realistic attitude for a Church spokesman to the racial policy of South Africa, upon which those clerics today who fall over themselves to castigate apartheid would do well to reflect.

Are you disturbed by the present situation in South Africa? — Yes, and no. Yes, in so far as South Africa has been made the object of criticism that is largely prejudiced or, to say the least, uninformed. Also because all the fair promises concerning other parts in Africa have proved to be such a grievous disappointment. No, because it is clear that the South African situation, despite its defects, is stable, secure, and full of prospects for future development. I believe that when one considers a country's socio-political future it must always be against the background of its economic possibilities. In this respect, South Africa offers unrivalled possibilities, unequalled anywhere in Africa. For this reason I foresee a happy issue out of our current social and political difficulties, including those arising from the multi-racial character of our society.

Will this necessarily involve the abandoning of the apartheid policy? — Not necessarily.

But is apartheid not an injustice which must go? — It all depends what you mean by apartheid. It is crucial in any discussion on this subject to distinguish clearly between the idea of apartheid, or separate development, or whatever else it may be called, on the one hand and, on the other, the actual laws and regulations which the public authorities may make to implement the theory. The question to be asked is whether or not injustice is inherently involved in the policy of separate development as it is being currently pursued.

Is the theory of apartheid or separate development not in itself vicious? — There is no teaching of the Church in opposition to the idea of a state composed of a number of national or racial groups maintained in their separate and distinct identity by the state of which they form a part. This is clear from the Church's attitude concerning the rights of national minorities, so hotly debated during the first fifty years of this century. This was reiterated recently in Pope John's encyclical *Peace on Earth*. The Church has often declared that public authorities have an obligation to assist the cultural and racial groups in a pluralistic state in their distinctive development.

Can it be said that the Church does not regard the destructhion of such groups as a matter of indifference? — That is correct. The Church regards as immoral any policy aimed at levelling such ethnic groups into an amorphous cosmopolitan mass. The Bishops of the United States have even gone so far as to say that these heterogeneous racial and cultural groups have an innate right to exist. This is also the attitude taken up by the United Nations in 1948-49, when it condemned genocide, which was extended in meaning to include the physical destruction or enforced integration not only of racial groups but of national and religious groups as well.

Has South African apartheid been officially condemned by the Church? — In 1958, Catholics were informed by the Chairman of the Administrative Board of the South African Catholic Bishops Conference that they were perfectly free to vote for any of the parties contesting the general election. This response could not have been given if any party had been judged to be advocating a policy which, considered as a whole, was immoral.

Why do you say "considered as a whole?" Are there items in the present Government's policy which could be considered immoral? — It is common knowledge that the application of several provisions of our racial legislation involve hardship and injustice: conditions of Bantu urban employment; unreasonable job reservation; restriction on the Bantu worker to improve his economic and social position; restriction on the freedom of the Bantu worker to choose his employer, to alternate employment, or to offer his services to the highest bidder; restriction on the place of abode which separates members of the same family.

How can a Catholic vote for a party which pursues a policy involving the violation of such human rights? — In no society can every man have the full exercise of those right which belong to him theoretically as a human person. By the very fact that he is a person, man is essentially a social being, and living in any society whatsoever necessarily imposes on him a restriction of his freedom of action as an individual. On the other hand, the curtailment (even when considerable), is outweighed by the advantages enjoyed through living in a community with others. It cannot be said that curtailment of the individuals' rights necessarily constitutes an injustice. In this context it must be remembered throughout that when we use the words "right" and "justice".

we are not using them in their original legal sense. A legal right is a provision of the laws favourable to the individual, clearly stated, and able to be proven in court from documentary evidence. Legal justice is the exact interpretation of the written document and its equitable application to a particular case. When we speak of "human rights", however, we are concerned with general norms in terms of which men develop and have their place in society. It is always a matter of more or less, according to the individual's make-up and the condition of the society in which he lives. "Justice" in this context is a balancing of the needs of the individual against the general needs and possibilties of the society in which he lives.

This always leaves room for legitimate disagreement when it comes to practical measures, as Pope Leo XIII has made clear in his encyclical on Christian democracy. Likewise, particular questions of human right very often cannot be decided by the simple "yes" and "no" method, as Pope Pius XII told the congress of Catholic jurists in 1953. In their 1952 statement, our bishops applied this to the South African scene in these words: "The racial problem admits of no easy solution . . . the choice of a proper course of action in the solution of the racial problem can never be easy . . . charity and justice must apply the driving force, prudence must be the guide." What has been said remains in the realm of principle; it is for men versed and specialised in different branches of study and technique to apply these principles to difficult and complicated situations. It will be no easy task. In a political society composed of various types and cultures there will always be pressure groups and sections of the population with special interests which influence the policies of the different political parties, more or less. The Christian can, however, exercise his vote in favour of any of these parties, provided only that in the overall view he considers its policy one which will achieve the general stability of the society as a whole.

But does not the policy of separate development, which involves extensive Government interference in the lives of so many individuals, bring with it necessarily an undue infringement of human rights? — It is difficult to know with certainty. The highly complex structure of modern society has forced governments everywhere to interfere more and more in the lives of their subjects. This is especially true of the welfare state, where virtually every aspect of life is regulated by public authorities of different kinds. Exactly where the boundary line lies, beyond which governing bodies may not legitimately go, is impossible to discern in general. It has to be judged in each particular case. So we read in Pope John's encyclical *Peace on Earth:* "Indeed, the whole reason for the existence of civil authorities is the realisation of the common good. It is clearly necessary that in pursuing this objective they should respect its essential elements and, at the same time, conform their laws to the needs of a given historical situation."

Surely apartheid, which denies the democratic principle of "one man, one vote" by excluding eighty per cent of the population of the electorate, cannot be reconciled with Christianity? — The first point to make clear is that the Church has never considered democracy to be the only form of government compatible with Christianity. In *Peace on Earth*, Pope John wrote: "It is impossible to determine once and for all what is the most suitable form of government, or how civil authorities can most effectively fulfil their respective function . . . in determining the structure and operation of government which a state is to have, great weight has to be given to the historical background and circumstances of given political communities, circumstances which will vary at different times and in different places." Even in a State which is democratic in structure, the "one man, one vote" principle is not always desirable. Thus the Pope goes on: "It is in keeping with their dignity as persons that human beings should take an active part in government, although the manner in which they share in it will depend on the level of development of the political community to which they belong." We know, for instance, how restricted the electorate was in ancient Athens, the home of democracy, and even today it is not considered a grave injustice that women in Switzerland have no vote. In recent times we have seen too many cases of the "one man, one vote" slogan being used as a pretext by demagogues to seize power which they exploit for their own ends. A democracy based on a wide electorate seems to secure the common good only in highly developed and homogeneous societies. This is freely acknowledged in Africa.

This, too, was in the minds of the South African bishops in 1962 when they declared that "the great majority of non-Europeans, and particularly the Africans, have not yet reached a stage of development that would justify their integration into a homogeneous society with the European . . . the association of men, coming together in societies, gives rise to other rights which can be termed secondary, derivative or contingent. They vary greatly according to the type of society evolved, the recognition accorded them and the qualifications

necessary to possess them. Among such are to be included the right to vote in the election of legislative bodies." In South Africa, there is a growing tendency to accord to non-Europeans an active participation in the affairs of the country. That these differ for different groups is in keeping with Pope John's statement quoted above. In the Cape, the Coloured people have elected representatives in Parliament. The recent establishment of the Transkeian Parliament, with its considerable power of local government, and the formation of the National Indian Council, are further new beginnings.

You have spoken so far in terms of justice. Does not the Christian law of charity bring a new element into the whole discussion? — From the point of view of the individual and his motivation, yes; from the point of view of public policy, no. Charity is a gift to man from God, by which man is given a share in the life of God, so that his whole being and his actions have something of the divine about them. It does not, however, bring a new norm or criterion of action into the world and its affairs, but rather a new driving force. So Pope John writes in *Peace on Earth* of the perfect human society which he envisages as "an order founded on truth, built according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity". For this reason, the expression "law of charity" is a very unhappy one, opening the door as it does to possible confusion of thought. Our bishops tried particularly to guard against this confusion when they wrote in their 1952 statement: "Charity does not, of course, oblige us to disregard differences of condition and culture. There will always be inequalities in society that necessarily affect human relations."

What, then, would be your advice to a person really anxious to do something to improve things in this country? — No better advice can be found than the warning and encouragement given by Pope John at the end of *Peace on Earth:* "There are some souls, particularly endowed with generosity, who, in finding situations where the requirements of justice are not satisfied or not satisfied in full, feel enkindled with the desire to change the state of things, as if they wished to have recourse to something like a revolution. It must be born in mind that to proceed gradually is the law of life in all its expressions. Therefore, in human institutions, too, it is not possible to renovate for the better except by working from within them gradually."

LIBERALS BADLY SHAKEN BY WHELAN STATEMENT

After Archbishop Whelan issued his statement, this commentary was made by the South African Observer, Mr. S. E. D. Brown's admirable nationalist journal.

Strenuous efforts are now being made by the South African English-language news-papers to mask the significance of the statement on race relations issued towards the end of last month by the Archbishop of Bloemfontein, the Most Rev. W. P. Whelan, O.M.I. The *Rand Daily Mail,* always zealous to preserve an illusion of objectivity, one of the most carefully guarded possessions of a "free Press", proceeded to transfer its own reaction of shock to someone else, as the following headlines show: "Whelan Shocks Laity —Public Condemnation of Apartheid Wanted — Clergy Fear Effect on Africans".

As Archbishop Whelan himself remarked in an interview with *Dagbreek,* efforts appeared to have been made on all sides to whip up passions and excite hostility over an issue which quite obviously called for a calm approach and a brotherly exchange of opinions. The malice which a section of the Press was so quick to inject into the discussion provides the clearest evidence of the impurity of the motives of many of those most actively involved in efforts to impose leftish-liberal solutions in South African race problems. Loading the Archbishop with reproaches in the form of slanted reporting, leading articles and cartoons, these newspapers created an atmosphere that almost totally excluded any genuine discussion — and it is hard to escape the conclusion that was precisely what they intended.

The gist of the Archbishop's statement can be found in his replies to two questions which he himself poses: *Is the theory of apartheid or separate development in itself vicious?* — The Church's teachings are clear from its attitude concerning human rights of national minorities. This was reiterated recently in Pope John's Encyclical, *Peace on Earth.* The Church has often declared that public authorities have an obligation to assist cultural and racial groups in a pluralistic state in their distinctive development. *Can it be said that the Church does not regard the destruction of such groups as a matter of indifference?* — That is correct. The Church regards as immoral any policy aimed at levelling such ethnic groups into an amorphous, cosmopolitan mass.

Newspapers which expected to see Archbishop Whelan's statement bluntly repudiated by the Bishops' Conference in Pretoria a week later were disappointed.

As the Johannesburg *Star* put it in a leading article: "The statement on apartheid by the Catholic Bishops' Conference is brief and uninformative and its only expression of opinion platitudinous — recognising the complexity of the situation and the need for law and order, for justice to all and a spirit of charity. What it does do fairly specifically is to reject Archbishop Whelan's claim . . . to have spoken officially for the Church in South Africa." Wisely, in all the circumstances, the Catholic archbishops declined to thresh out in public differences which have now clearly appeared and which run very deep. If, as they affirm, statements by individual bishops are made on their own responsibility, this applies equally and forcibly to Archbishop Denis Hurley, of Durban, who has uncompromisingly declared time and time again that apartheid is un-Christian. The important question that now confronts the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in South Africa can be more precisely formulated as follows: *Is an insistence on the preservation of racial or national or cultural identity intrinsically immoral and un-Christian?* And the question must be considered altogether apart from whatever measures are taken in this or any other country in efforts to secure and preserve such identity.

Deeper Issue

As the Archbishops will have realised by this time, this is only a small part of a much bigger and deeper question: it is like the small pinnacle of floating ice that warns the sailor that he is in the presence of a mighty iceberg, nine-tenths of it submerged and out of view. The real question that challenges all the churches today, the Roman Catholic included, is this: *Is the Leftist-Liberal social revolution, whose influence is felt today on every plane of human activity, itself Christian or un-Christian?* Or, to address the same question more directly to churchmen: *What is the moral quality of the new "Social Gospel" which is widely being preached today?* For it is this "Social Gospel", this new formulation of the Christian mission, embracing as it does a revised set of values and aims, that has made a sin and an evil of the preservation of all forms of group identity — for the first time since the founding of Christianity! This is the question that marks the real point of parting — and not questions about the moral quality of the policy of race separation in South Africa.

Answer the bigger question, and the others are answered automatically, or they simply fall away. The expression "Social Gospel" has only recently come into general use, but it represents a set of influences that have been at work for a long time in nearly all the churches of the West. It stands for one side of a deep cleavage in the soul of Western man. It stands for a new yielding to the temptations of the intellect, a new Pharisaism, if you like, or the old Pharisaism in a modern context. The invention of the expression "Social Gospel" means that the phenomenon it labels has at last been clearly identified. We name it because we know it, because we have been able to circumscribe it and pin it down. Gustave Thibon, the Catholic philosopher, calls it the "democratic mystique": but he leaves us in no doubt that he has identified the same phenomenon: "It is the inevitable result of the religious sentiment degenerating into politics . . . . This caricature of a reply to the *universal* appeal of God is the basic cause of the appearance and survival of *universal* suffrage."

Let us have an end to the smoke and smother. Let us dare to proclaim the true nature of the fatal disjunction that has appeared in organised religion throughout the Western world. Bisecting all, or nearly all, of the Christian denominations, Roman Catholicism included, there has appeared a schism as deep as the soul. One side of the schism is represented by what is today identified as the Communist-inspired "Social Gospel", what Thibon calls "religion degenerating into politics". So now the question is being increasingly forced upon the attention of mankind: What is religion? What is it — in essence? Is it a set of ethics designed to make any particular political organisation "work"? Is it a science of human relations for an imagined kind of society, a science fortified with religious sentiment? If it is that, then religion is precisely what the new "Social Gospel" tells us it is. Or is religion, on the other hand, what men have always taken it to be: the key to the full self-discovery of the individual? And of the full self-realisation of the individual? The key to the unfolding of the best inborn potentialities of the individual? Is it that science of the heart that alone shows the way to organic reality in all human organisation? Does the individual find salvation within himself and transfer his state of grace to society? Or does he find it only in society, in some Utopia of the politicians? And is it the true role of churchmen to set themselves up as ethical policemen for a new kind of collectivist political Utopia, zealously proscribing all those attitudes and impulses which arise in human nature and which militate against the attainment of such a Utopia? If this is true Christianity, then it follows that anything which these ethical policemen do not like — and that includes apartheid — is un-Christian. That is their claim. Fascinated by the blueprint of a new kind of

society, these churchmen of the Left now eagerly make propaganda for the attitudes which such a society will demand — in the masses if not in the leaders.

Madmen With Utopias

All that is valid in this drive to the Left is the yearning for salvation by which it is powered. What is dangerous in it is the monomaniac insistence that salvation for the individual can be found only in social revolution. As G. K. Chesterton put it: "These madmen with their political Utopias have lost everything except their reason: inside their system of reason all is consistency: but their whole system of reason is out of consistency with reality." Let us, therefore, be careful never to lose sight of the real issue. Is it possible for collective humanity, loaded with imperfections, to find a quick and easy salvation in that new kind of society that has captured the imagination and enlisted the zeal of so many educated people in the Western world?

There are men in the centre of Catholicism ready with vigorous answers to such questions. Here is a sample from Gustave Thibon: "Formerly what belonged to religion encroached on things political . . . . but for a long time now we have had the opposite state of affairs: the fever of politics attracts to itself most of the religious energies of humanity. The quest of the highest good has become a 'social question'. There is an implicit belief that reforms in purely political (or even administrative) order are capable of curing all the deep-seated ills of humanity". He writes, too, of the "revolutionary ideal" which many of us now recognise in the churches' "Social Gospel": "It is not a promise, an embryo of Christianity: it is a cancer — there is an outward resemblance between the two things, as every biologist knows — which develops in the Christian organism what it is impoverished and corrupt". And he goes on: "The Christian idea is menaced today by its contrary and by its parody simultaneously: by those who deny it and by those who prostitute it. The jaws of the pincers are equally repulsive".

It is this uniform apostacy of a spurious idealism which has given an appearance of identity and unity to the ecumenicity of the many different churches that have been drawn into the orbit of the World Council of Churches — they are like so many different kinds of bread infected with the same green mould. It is a division of aims and of loyalties co-extensive with Western civilisation, a division whose baleful consequences flow into every sphere of activity. In our own universities we see the same Communist-inspired social-revolutionary trend, expressed as a sort of new "philosophy" or "world view", everywhere closing doors and windows on the human spirit, a "Liberalism" which is the very essence of illiberalism. As M. Stanton Evans, a leading young American intellectual, has expressed it in his book *Revolt on the Campus*: "Free enquiry is precisely what we do not have on American campuses. Instead, we have a machine for moulding students into acceptance of Liberal values. There is no true dialectic between ideas: there is only a fuge in which associated strains of thought are contrapunted in the feeblest simulacrum of argument". The "Social Gospel" expresses the same "world view", the same collectivist, social-revolutionary trend — the only difference is that it uses a religious terminology.

Even science, with its own traditional inner religion of relentless honesty and discipline, has failed to escape the blight of a yearning for salvation that seeks a fulfilment in society rather than in the individual. Parallel with Thibon's "caricature of Christianity", we find in our universities a mordant anti-culture, and in the realm of science a new anti-science, that has made its most dangerous inroads precisely in those branches of learning and study that have to do with the identification of man: psychology, anthropology, ethnology, ethnography, genetics and in biology in general. All these disciplines languish today under the pall of a partnership viciously intolerant of dissent as it advances with a kind of religious fervour and with unproved ideas that help foster the social revolution.

The hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church will never compose its differences if it cannot or dare not see South Africa's race question in this wider context of a Western civilisation deeply divided on fundamentals. In the meantime, the magnificant stand by Archbishop Whelan in the cause of truth, common sense and civilisation will have earned him the gratitude of countless thousands here and overseas.

A MINE OF INFORMATION: Back-numbers of Candour are essential reading for all patriots newly engaged in the battle for national survival. Send £3 for fifteen different issues to Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

Read FOCAL POINT for a new approach to the policies Britain needs. Write to Focal Point, Suite 411, 76 Shoe Lane, London E.C.4.

HAS "SEARCHLIGHT" A FAULTY BEAM?

Readers who keep a close watch on the shadier aspects of Left-wing politics will be familiar with the name *Searchlight*. The journal (if that is not too complimentary a term) which possesses that name is a far-Left effort which endeavours to feed stories purporting to "expose fascists" to the grubby-fingered hacks of the media. Those newspaper and television hacks who lap up such tales apparently find it of little concern that so extreme were the Leftist views of Maurice Ludmer, the ex-*Morning Star* soccer scribbler-turned-garden gnome who founded *Searchlight* and edited it till last year when he went to meet his Maker, that he actually resigned from the "British" Communist Party *because it was not Left-wing enough!* Ludmer's ideas were evidently so far off at a Marxist tangent that perhaps he should have emigrated to Albania — a country whose profession of Communism is so pure that not only are the Russian and Chinese varieties damned, but its leaders end up putting bullets in each other at Politburo meetings as a result of arguing the toss over obscure aspects of Marxist dialetics.

Pointing The Finger

We have had cause before to draw attention to instances where the anti-"fascist" zealots of *Searchlight* have allowed themselves to be carried away by their desire to point the finger at "bogeymen" on the Right. Last November's issue, for instance, sought to suggest that the Editor of *Candour* was involved in an organisation which contemplated forming a guerilla movement in the event of civil disturbances or the advent to power of a Bennite government. A letter published in the civil defence magazine, *Protect and Survive Monthly*, provides yet another instance of *Searchlight's* seemingly fertile imagination; indeed, the correspondent, Major Ian Souter-Clarence, gives the impression that on this occasion the journal's writers must have immersed themselves in manure! We print it verbatim, as its content speaks for itself.

"In the May issue of *Protect and Survive Monthly* you published as a Guest Editorial a letter I wrote to you. Following this, I believe you have received a great deal of mis-information about myself from Left-wing sources. As these are grossly misleading, may I ask your indulgence to refute them, and in so doing throw some light on the methods of the Red Front and those opposed to Civil Defence for this Country.

"The attacks on me originate with two childishly melodramatic T.V. features, one produced by *T.V. Eye* and the other by the Granada *World in Action* team. In each case they tried to represent perfectly legitimate Survival Courses which I organise as a form of sinister paramilitary 'training' for dangerous 'Nazis'. In the event, both programmes were so puerile that viewers may well have formed their own judgement as to their veracity. Nonetheless, for the Left the smear was too good to miss and was immediately enlarged upon by the Communist magazine *Searchlight*, whose articles always allow imagination to take precedence over fact. It was also echoed in a minor key by one or two of the little comics which masquerade as daily 'newspapers'.

"*Searchlight* stated that I am a member of a paramilitary Nazi organisation called Column 88. This is a deliberate lie. I have never been a member of this mysterious group or any other Nazi organisation; in fact, I do not belong to any political party at all.

"Not surprisingly, the lie has been accepted and repeated in the current issue of *Sanity*, the organ of the C.N.D., which was to be expected in view of the high percentage of Communists in that organisation, including their National Organiser, Sally Davison (see *Daily Telegraph*, 23 July 1981). The lie was further embroidered by a photo published in *Searchlight* purporting to show me 'shedding a few words of sympathy over the graves of S.S. men in Belgium last year'. The truth is that the occasion was a Remembrance Ceremony at Tyne Cot British Military Ceremony at Pasendale, when I was asked to pay honour to the eleven thousand British soldiers who lie buried there. These ceremonies are held once a year at a gathering of members of Right-wing organisations who are united in their determination that the sacrifices made in the past shall not result in the Sovietisation of Britain and Western Europe; a sentiment with which I am in full and unashamed agreement.

"The Left have made no attempt to answer the points raised by my article, preferring the old political ploy that when ideas cannot be countered effectively, then you attack the author instead. The word 'Nazi' has long been an epithet used by the Left to discredit those they cannot silence.

"It is no secret that the primary task ofthe Red Front is to induce a political climate which will lead to immediate surrender should this Country be attacked by the Soviets. People who run Survival Courses naturally counter this insidious "nuclear neurosis" and are, therefore, seen by hard-core Communists as implacable enemies. As for their softer comrades of the 'sandals, painted faces, Ban-the-Bomb' brigade, the very word 'Survival' appears

to act as catalyst to their muddled emotions, fusing malice, envy, fear and ignorance into an all-pervading hatred.

"However, one thing they can be sure: at the last count it will be 'survival of the fittest', nature's eternal law, and in these stakes their own mental attitudes deprive them of any chance. Perhaps deep down in their psyche they know this, hence their frentic outbursts against those who are not afraid to denounce their suicidal activities against our Island Home."

The original letter from Major Souter-Clarance which provoked *Searchlight's* wrath had declaimed against proposals by certain Left-wing dominated Labour councils to abandon spending on civil defence and emergency planning. Their plans, his letter argued, could lead to "the Gulag Archipelago [filled] to overflowing and defeatists, 'moles', trendy clerics and the whole stew-pot of cranks, fools and traitors will have plenty of time to discuss 'what went wrong' as they struggle to fulfil their work-norms in a most inclement climate." The proprietors of *Protect and Survive Monthly* are to be commended for according such truths editorial status. Their magazine, which makes instructive reading for all those concerned with national survival, is available from newsagents for 65p. or by writing direct to Protect and Survive Ltd., 80 Fleet Street, London EC4Y 1EL.

PIUS XII AND THE JEWS

Sometime ago Rolf Rochhuth's play *The Representative* asserted that Pope Pius XII did not do enough to help Jews escape the Nazis. Dr. J. D. Holmes, author of *The Papacy in the Modern World,* offered a rather different view in a recent article in *The Universe* when he claimed that Pope Pius went out of his way to assist Jews in Rome. Apparently, in September 1943 the German Chief of Police in Rome threatened to send some 200 Jews to the Russian front unless they produced within 36 hours 50 kilograms of gold, or the equivalent in dollars or sterling. The Chief Rabbi aproached the Vatican, which immediately placed 15 kilograms at his disposal and lent him the necessary money. Dr. Holmes claims, however, that the Jews succeeded in raising the money themselves. They seem to have been in rather cushy circumstances in this "mid-Holocaust" period!

We found Dr. Holmes' comments on Pope Pius' action interesting, for in effect it reduced by 200 the troops available to combat the atheistic forces of Bolshevism. Why should these Jews have been exempt if they were sincere in their claim to be "good Italians"? Men throughout Europe were subject to conscription and certainly *lots* of Germans, Hungarians and Rumanians were conscripted for the Russian front without option and without the protection of Vatican gold. It also strikes us that as in the latter part of the war thousands of *Catholic* Italian children were scampering round streets and ruins barefoot and starving, picking an existence as best they might, there were better uses for Vatican wealth (which was contributed by people who were often poor themselves) if it *had* to be given away.

WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT

Wyndham Lewis, after surveying the growing chaos of the pre-war world, wrote: "To outdo your neighbour in humbug and misrepresentation has been at all times accepted as the proper function of 'diplomacy'. No-one expects a Foreign Office to be a model of veracity; that would be absurd. But there must *somewhere* be *somebody* who has a shot at getting the facts relatively right, exactly and reliably stated, and methodically arranged. There must be some department of discourse, where *the truth*-and-damn-the-consequences is the only thing aimed at, rather than merely the most handy and plausible misrepresentation of facts and of events."

That precisely describes the function that *Candour* aspires to perform.

We have tried to keep subscription rates as low as possible and have tried to make few appeals for funds. However, our growing correspondence, increased printing costs and astronomical postage rates will kill *Candour* unless we have the financial support of those readers who are able to afford it.

G. K. Chesterton wrote long ago: "We are the people of England and we have not spoken yet." *We,* among others, are endeavouring to speak for England and with your assistance we can continue to publish truths to be shouted from the roof-tops to force traitors to listen until we get the right kind of rule or get ourselves jailed in the process.

Please send your donation now. Think of a sum, double it — if possible, *re-double it* — and send it to the A. K. Chesterton Trust, Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

THE SERVILE STATE by HILAIRE BELLOC

CAPITALISM'S TRANSITION TO COLLECTIVISM

The Capitalist State is unstable, and indeed more properly a transitory phase lying between two permanent and stable states of society. In order to appreciate why this is so, let us recall the definition of the Capitalist State: "A society in which the ownership of the means of production is confined to a body of free citizens, not large enough to make up properly a general character of that society, while the rest are dispossessed of the means of production, and are therefore proletarian, we call Capitalist."

Note the several points of such a state of affairs. You have private ownership; but it is not private ownership distributed in many hands and thus familiar as an institution to society as a whole. Again, you have the great majority dispossessed but at the same time citizens, that is, men politically free to act, though economically impotent; again, though it is but an inference from our definition, it is a necessary inference that there will be under Capitalism a conscious, direct and planned *exploitation* of the majority, the free citizens who do not own by the minority who are owners. For wealth must be produced: the whole of that community must live: and the possessors can make such terms with the non-possessors as shall make it certain that a portion of what the non-possessors have produced shall go to the possessors.

A society thus constituted cannot endure. It cannot endure because it is subject to very severe strains: strains which increase in severity in proportion as that society becomes more thoroughly Capitalist . . .

Destruction Of Security

[One] strain in Capitalism . . . consists in the fact that Capitalism destroys security. Experience is enough to save us any delay upon this main point of our matter. But even without experience we could reason with absolute certitude from the very nature of Capitalism that its chief effect would be the destruction of security in human life.

Combine these two elements: the ownership of the means of production by a very few; the political freedom of owners and non-owners alike. There follows immediately from that combination a competitive market wherein the labour of the non-owner fetches just what it is worth, not as full productive power, but as productive power which will leave a surplus to the Capitalist. It fetches nothing when the labourer cannot work, more in proportion to the pace at which he is driven; less in middle age than in youth; less in old age than in middle age; nothing in sickness; nothing in despair . . . The aspect from [which] Capital looks at a human being whose labour it proposes to purchase cuts right across that normal aspect of human life from which we all regard our own affections, duties, and character. A man thinks of himself, of his chances and of his security along the line of his own affections, duties, and character. A man thinks of himself, of his chances and of his security along the line of his own individual existence from birth to death. Capital purchasing his labour (and not the man himself) purchases but a cross-section of his life, his moments of activity. For the rest, he must fend for himself; but to fend for yourself when you have nothing is to starve.

As a matter of fact, where a few possess the means of production perfectly free political conditions are impossible. A perfect Capitalist State cannot exist (for in one) there would be no food available for the non-owner save when he was actually engaged in Production, and that absurdity would, by quickly ending all human lives save those of the owners, put an end to the arrangement . . . As a fact, of course . . . Capitalism must keep alive, by non-Capitalist methods, great masses of the population who would otherwise starve to death; and that is what Capitalism was careful to do to an increasing extent as it got a stronger and stronger grip upon the English people. Elizabeth's Poor Law at the beginning of the business, the Poor Law of 1834, coming at a moment when nearly half England had passed into the grip of Capitalism, are original and primitive instances: there are today a hundred others.

Though this cause of insecurity — the fact that the possessors have no direct incentive to keep men alive — is logically the most obvious, and always the most enduring under a Capitalist system, there is another cause more poignant in its effect upon human life. That other cause is the competitive anarchy in production which restricted ownership coupled with freedom involves.

If full political freedom be allowed to any two such possessors of implements and stores, each will actively watch his market, attempt to undersell the other, tend to overproduce at the end of some season of extra demand for his article, thus glut the market only to suffer a period of depression afterwards — and so forth. Again, the Capitalist, free, individual

director of production, will miscalculate; sometimes he will fail, and his works will be shut down. Again, a mass of isolated, imperfectly instructed competing units cannot but direct their clashing efforts at an enormous waste, and that waste will fluctuate. Most commissions, most advertisements, most parades, are examples of this waste. If this waste of effort could be made a constant, the parasitical employment it afforded would be a constant too. But of its nature it is a most inconstant thing, and the employment it affords is therefore necessarily precarious. The concrete translation of this is the insecurity of the commercial traveller, the advertising agent, the insurance agent, and every form of touting and cozening which competitive Capitalism carries with it.

Now here again, as in the case of the insecurity produced by age and sickness, Capitalism cannot be pursued to its logical conclusion, and it is the element of freedom which suffers. Competition is, as a fact, restricted to an increasing extent by an understanding between the competitors, accompanied, especially in this country, by the ruin of the smaller competitor through secret conspiracies entered into by the larger men, and supported by the secret political forces of the State. In a word, Capitalism, proving almost as unstable to the owners as to the non-owners, is tending towards stability by losing its essential character of political freedom. No better proof of the instability of capitalism as a system could be desired.

Take any one of the numerous Trusts which now control English industry, and have made of modern England the type, quoted throughout the Continent, of artificial monopolies. If the full formula of Capitalism were accepted by our Courts and our executive statesmen, anyone could start a rival business, undersell those Trusts and shatter the comparative security they afford to industry within their field. The reason that no one does is that political freedom is not, as a fact, protected here by the Courts in commercial affairs. A man attempting to compete with one of our great English Trusts would find himself at once undersold . . .

A Mark Of Transition

But it must always be remembered that these conspiracies in restraint of trade which are the mark of modern England are in themselves a mark of the transition from the true Capitalist phase to another . . . Given a Capitalist State, of its nature unstable, it will tend to reach stability by some method or another . . . [and] cannot but be transformed into some other arrangement wherein Society may repose . . .

Now, in attempting to remedy the evils of Capitalism by remedying an ill distribution of property, you have two, and only two courses open to you. If you are suffering because property is restricted to a few, you can alter that factor in the problem *either* by putting property into the hands of many, *or* by putting it into the hands of none. There is no third course.

In the concrete, to put property into the hands of "none" means to vest it as a trust in the hands of political officers. If you say that the evils proceeding from Capitalism are due to the institution of property itself, and not to the dispossession of the many by the few, then you must forbid the private possession of the means of production by any particular and private part of the community; but someone must control the means of production, or we should have nothing to eat. So in practice this doctrine means the management of the means of production by those who are the public officers of the community. Whether these public officers are themselves controlled by the community or not has nothing to do with this solution on its economic side. The essential point to grasp is that the only alternative to private property is public property. Somebody must see to the ploughing and must control the ploughs; otherwise no ploughing will be done.

It is equally obvious that if you conclude property in itself to be no evil but only the small number of its owners, then your remedy is to increase the number of those owners.

So much being grasped, we may recapitulate and say that a society like ours . . . will necessarily contemplate the reform of its ill-distributed ownership on one of two models. The first is the negation of private property and the establishment of what is called Collectivism: that is, the management of the means of production by the political officers of the community. The second is the wider distribution of property until that institution shall become the mark of the whole State, and until free citizens are normally found to be possessors of capital or land, or both.

The first model we call Socialism or the Collectivist State; the second we call the Proprietary or Distributive State . . . The model chosen by reformers is the first model, that of a Collectivist State . . . This comes about from the fact that not a Distributive but a Collectivist solution is the easiest for a Capitalist State to aim at . . . yet, in the very act of attempting Collectivism, what results is not Collectivism at all, but the servitude of the many, and the confirmation in their present privilege of the few; that is, the Servile State.

Those who favour the Distributive State . . . are men who respect and would, if possible, preserve the old forms of Christian European life. They know that property was thus distributed throughout the State during the happiest periods of our past history; they also know that where it is properly distributed today, you have greater social sanity and ease than elsewhere. In general, those who would re-establish, if possible, the Distributive State in the place of, and so a remedy for, the vices and unrest of Capitalism, are men concerned with known realities, and having for their ideal a condition of society which experience has tested and proved both stable and good.

The Collectivist, on the other hand, proposes to put land and capital into the hands of the political officers of the community, and this on the understanding that they shall hold such land and capital in trust for the advantage of the community . . . There is a sense in which this Socialist is more practical than that other type of reformer, from the fact that the stage of the disease into which we have fallen apparently admits of his remedy with less shock than it admits of a reaction towards well-divided property.

For example, the operation of buying out some great tract of private ownership today (as a railway or a harbour company) with public funds, continuing its administration by publicly paid officials and converting its revenue to public use, is a thing with which we are familiar and which seemingly might be indefinitely multiplied. Individual examples of such transformation of waterworks, gas tramways, from a Capitalist to a Collectivist basis are common, and the change does not disturb any fundamental thing in our society . . .

Upon the contrary, the attempt to create a large number of shareholders in such enterprises and artificially to substitute many partners, distributed throughout a great number of the population, in the place of the original few capitalist owners, would prove lengthy and at every step would arouse opposition, would create disturbance, would work at an expense of great friction, and would be imperilled by the power of the new and many owners to sell again to a few. In a word, the man who desires to re-establish property as an institution normal to most citizens is *working against the grain* of our existing Capitalist society, while a man who desires to establish Socialism — that is, Collectivism — is working *with* the grain of that society . . . It is not the purpose of this book to show how . . . a condition of well-divided property might be restored and might take the place . . . of that Capitalism which is now no longer either stable of tolerable; but . . . difficulties surround the Distributive solution and . . . therefore the Collectivist solution appeals so much more readily to men living under Capitalism . . .

Thoroughly Suited

The Collectivist experiment is thoroughly suited (in appearance at least) to the Capitalist society which it proposes to replace . . . So true is all this that . . a trust or monopoly is welcomer because it "furnishes a mode of transition from private to public ownership." Collectivism promises employment to the great mass who think of production only in terms of employment. It promises to its workmen the security which a great and well-organised industrial Capitalist unit (like one of our railways) can give through a system of pensions, regular promotions, etc., but that security vastly increased through the fact that it is the State and not a mere unit of the State which guarantees it. Collectivism would administer, would pay wages, would promote, would pension off, would fine — and all the rest of it — exactly as the Capitalist State does today. The proletarian, when the Collectivist (or Socialist) State is put before him, perceives nothing in the picture save certain ameliorations of his present position. Who can imagine that if, say, two of our great industries, Coal and Railways, were handed over to the State tomorrow, the armies of men organised therein would find any change in the character of their lives, save in some increase of security and possibly in a very slight increase of earnings?

The whole scheme of Collectivism presents, so far as the proletarian mass of a Capitalist State is concerned, nothing unknown at all, but a promise of some increment in wages and a certainty of far greater ease of mind.

To that small minority of a Capitalist society which owns the means of production, Collectivism will of course appear as an enemy, but, even so, it is an enemy which they understand and an enemy with whom they can treat in terms common both to that enemy and to themselves. If, for instance, the State proposes to take over such and such a trust now paying four per cent., and believes that under State management it will make the trust pay five per cent., then the transference takes the form of a business proposition . . . Again, the State, having greater credit and longevity, can (it would seem) "buy out" any existing Capitalist body upon favourable terms. Again, the discipline by which the State would enforce its rules upon the proletariat it employed would be the same rules as those by which the Capitalist imposes discipline in his own interests

today.

There is in the whole scheme which proposes to transform the Capitalist into the Collectivist State no element of reaction, the use of no term with which a Capitalist society is not familiar, the appeal to no instinct, whether of cowardice, greed, apathy, or mechanical regulation, with which a Capitalist community is not amply familiar.

In general, if modern Capitalist England were made by magic a State of small owners, we should all suffer an enormous revolution . . . But if this modern Capitalist England could, by a process sufficiently slow to allow for readjustment of individual interests, be transformed into a Collectivist State, the apparent change at the end of that transition would not be conspicuous to the most of us, and the transition itself should have met with no shocks that theory can discover . . . Many incomes now involving considerable duties to the State would have been replaced by incomes as large or larger, involving much the same duties and bearing only the newer name of salaries. The small shop-keeping class would find itself in part absorbed under public schemes at a salary, in part engaged in the old work of distribution at secure incomes; and such small owners as are left, of boats, of farms, even of machinery, would perhaps know the new state of things into which they had survived through nothing more novel than some increase in the irritating system of inspection and of onerous petty taxation: they are already fairly used to both . . .

Many Collectivists in a generation immediately past believed that nothing stood between them and the realisation of their ideal save the unintelligence of mankind . . . Today . . . the most sincere and single-minded of Collectivists cannot but note that the practical effect of their propaganda is not an approach towards the Collectivist State at all, but towards something very different. It is becoming more and more evident that with every new reform — and those reforms commonly promoted by particular Socialists, and in a puzzled way blessed by Socialists in general — another state emerges more and more clearly. It is becoming increasingly certain that the attempted transformation of Capitalism into Collectivism is resulting not in Collectivism at all, but in some third thing which the Collectivist never dreamt of, or the Capitalist either; and that third thing is the Servile State: a State, that is, in which the mass of men shall be constrained *by law* to labour to the profit of a minority, but, as the price of such constraint, shall enjoy a security which the old Capitalism did not give them.

To be continued.

WILLITGETBETTERIFIPICKET

To prostitute my principles
Would be an act of shame
Thus sprach Wunarferskargil
Of agitator fame;
I'll not stand by to witness
All those things come to naught
For which my fine forefathers
So diligently fought.
If I must go to prison
Because I break the law
Which prostitutes my principles
Then that shall be the score.

Earnest Wunarferskargil
O brave and honest words
A mine of half-baked principles
Of custard-pie and curds.

O prostitute and pick-up
Let's form another line
And in the name of England
Put your small hand in mine
The oldest of professions
Is not half so bad
As highly-paid humbuggery
In an England gone quite mad.

B. E. BIGGS.

BE SURE TO READ

A. K. CHESTERTON'S

FACING THE ABYSS

A masterly analysis of the disastrous effects of liberalism on Britain and the world.

CHAPTERS INCLUDE:

★ Language of Betrayal
★ Subversion in the Universities
★ Amok-run of the Sexologists
★ The Capitalist-Communist Nexus
★ Partitioning the World
★ Line-Up Against South Africa
★ Tomorrow — A Plan for British Survival

ONLY £1 INCLUDING POSTAGE

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS.

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

Amid all the fuss and palaver about cases of racial attacks against Blacks, I seem to read very little in the press about the incontestable fact that in most inner cities there has been for some years a high incidence of street crimes perpetrated by Black youths against mainly elderly White members of the community. Although these strongly imply "racism", they are never designated as such and, as a consequence, the victims are treated as yet another crime statistic and there is no hoo-hah saturation publicity in the media. In fact, so sensitive does the issue seem to be that now the police *refuse* to issue relevant figures on anti-White muggings, despite the fact that they are reaching epidemic proportions in South London and elsewhere. Shouldn't such "racist" attacks *also* be the concern of any special police squad that is set up to investigate assaults on Blacks?

* * * *

Another aspect of the multi-racial mania that has gripped the nation following Scarface's Report is the suggestion that Black students should receive a head-start in the contest for university places. I presume this means that if the percentage of Black students reading, say, medicine is below the percentage of Blacks in the population, their numbers should be made good by dropping entrance qualifications to medical schools for them. And since there would be little use in admitting students to lengthy courses that they're unlikely to finish, logically the pass standard would have to be lowered in medical "finals", thus producing graduates who are less skilled and less proficient than would otherwise be the case. That the dubious goal of "racial balance" had been achieved would be small consolation to the students' future patients. What's the betting that all the race relations lobbyists would soon find an excuse to "go private"?

* * * *

People's conduct in the privacy of their homes is their affair, I have always believed. But news that a clique within the National Union of Teachers wants to have children taught in schools to display a "positive attitude to homosexuality" sickens me. These half-baked trendies want a situation where their juvenile charges are given lessons on homosexuality *by* homosexuals who will seek to put their mode of life on a par with heterosexuality. It is by and large the same "progressive" crowd who wish to subject their impressionable pupils to free contraceptives and abortion on demand. I suspect that if they are at all successful in getting at the minds of school-children, this latter objective will be rendered rather superfluous!

* * * *

Readers might recall that the objectionable Comrade Scargill took the *News of the World* to the Press Council two years ago for calling him a Communist. "Of course I'm not," he bleated, affirming that he'd left the Communist Party *ages* ago. Why, then, if he is so anxious to have people think he has rejected his Bolshie affiliation did he appear as guest speaker at the centenary celebration of the birth of Willie Gallagher, Scotland's first Communist — repeat, *Communist* — M.P.? Hasn't he sufficient nous to realise that he will be judged by the company he keeps? The Press Council should have told Scargill to take a running jump with his complaint, preferably down the nearest mine-shaft.

* * * *

Catholics and Odinists have been slogging it out with each other lately in the correspondence columns of *League Review* and *Spearhead*. One character in the latter journal claimed Christianity had a "brutal history" which had been "foisted onto us White Europeans . . . by the sword". Oh yes? I've just been looking at Butler's ***Lives of the Saints*** which tells how in 870 A.D. the Danish leader Ingvar had King Edmund of East Anglia tied to a tree and torn with whips, which he bore with patience calling upon the name of Christ. Then his tormentors shot at him with arrows, so as not to kill him, till his body was "like a hedgehog whose skin is closely set with quills, or a thistle covered with thorns". At last, Ingvar cut his bonds, dragged him from the tree to which he was nailed by the arrows, and had his head hacked off. St. Edmund the Martyr was a chap who *really* tangled with those Odinists. However, after the appearance of a mere letter criticising them in *League Review*, I advise my colleague Robert Blake to *watch out!*

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today !

U.K.	£4.00
Overseas airmail	£4.50
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House. Liss Forest and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

To serve as a link between Britons all over the world in protest against the surrender of their world heritage

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Price Eightpence. 3rd December, 1954

EUROPE—THE TRUT

By A. K. CHESTERTON

WHEN BLACK IS WHITE

LIBERALISM IN CANADA. — The Canadian Liberal Party has been holding its annual Rally in Ottawa, and has outlined the policies which a Liberal Government would pursue in that country. Readers will know what to expect from the fact that a major campaign "... second only to full-scale socialised medicine, was to be "All-out promotion of Lester B. Pears... as the man best fitted to guide Canada ... times in domestic and foreign affairs."

In the face of what was adm... American public sentiment ... rously sprang to Uncle ... O. Campney, Liber... audience that C... about the U... to live ... Uncl...

the *News Chronicle* were to print a photograph of ord Layton or of a member of the Cadbury family iving in Kampala dressed in a leopard-skin kaross, and announce that it was a picture of a typical Baganda man, the people of that count... even some of its own reader... I imagine that even Lord L... I would be somewhat startl... A described.

DISCRIMINATE—OR DIE!

...our... n the NOT THE SAME THING re the ... It would seem, how... opinion, ... not expect to encou... he Master ... such a situation in ... ublic are ... caption to a pictur... hey were ... -dered and ... n 1955 of the ... uality in the internationalist ... omination through their ir... the prospect of alien r...

Once "Referendum" ... e process was es... ... (the release ... ample of ... atriotic an... ... l practi... ... and ... ... n a standing ovation."

... *The Sunday Times* tha... ... with Mr. D. P. de ... ...lepers group—and had ... ...t again.

... ...e said was wrong, surel... ...ould ...ve been a complete exp... ...bout the C.F.R.!

But no! He was silenced.

I wrote to Mr. Botha, pointing ...et the whole story about the C.F.R. ...Carroll Quigley's highly authoritative bo... ...*nd Hope*. I told him that it was unnecessar... ...draw anything of what he h...

But ... then no parlian... ...nour... C.F.R. ... v... the

THE SIEGE OF SOUTHERN AFRICA

by IVOR BENSON

Candour feels impelled to give front page coverage to this fighting address by Mr. Ivor Benson, the well-known South African journalist and news analyst to the Southern Africa Solidarity Conference because this was ignored by the media although 1300 representatives attended. Only the Pretoria News carried a report which stated that ... ...nisses resistance ... Dr. ... the former newspaper man and broadcaster, ...

And, it is time ... was a fiery speech by Mr. Ivor Benson, ...

THEY WA...

All this, of course, is pr... ... leader ought to know. If they do ... to appear from their utterances and ... know. Otherwise they have only themselves ... if people begin to lose confidence in them.

Tonight, I am not going to try to tell you what I think political leaders ought to know. That would take too long.

My task, as I see it, is to make a few positive statements, knowing as I do that for each one of the... statements there is a great deal of incontrovertib... evidence.

THE ... NG FEW

...NEVIALLE

"How few think kindly of the thinking few,
How many never think, but think they do."

CUT AND THRUST

by KEVAN BLEACH

Still the cries fly thick and fast from substantial numbers of anti-Marketeers that an E.F.T.A.-type trade arrangement between Britain and the E.E.C. is the best alternative to continued membership. The ... ...members in providing reciproc... ...comprising over 100 million ... ...not constitute a closed ... ...civilisation ... ...ivism ... ...nership ... ...and modern ...

CHRISTIANITY—OR COMM...

The following article, condensed ... which appeared in the December, 1960 ... Observer" ... at paper's forth ... Mr. S. E. D...

STUDY conferences of th... becoming annual eve... ferences, initiated by ... to discuss the resp... the South Africa...

But as the ... to race rel... become, ... social, ... and, ... mu...

...rches are ... These con... ...uncil, purport ...stian Church in ... to race relatio...

... standpoint in r... ...trine, these dis... ...entures into the ... ...l controversy in ... ...l propaganda plat... ...ch the World Co... ...stern world in the ...

... the World Counc... ...in December of ... Responsibility in ... Its conference ta... ...er, 1960) will disc... ...l situation in Sou... ...ding of the Gospel ...understanding of cor... viewpoint; the witn... mission and gor... emergency situ...

Certainly ... do the rel... not so ... Churc...

To serve as a link between Britons all over the world in protest against the surrender of their world heritage

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Price Sixpence. 27th January, 1961

CO-EXISTENCE HELPS COMMUNISM

...NT LE...

... find a d... ...member Ch... ...es Chairman ... the slogan ... ...ording to ... ...nist ...

... Church ... ...nmunists ... ...alities. The ... ...ev. Eugene ... ...uncil arrogantly ... ...tion, that Federal ... ...orce racial equality

BRITAIN AWAKE

COMMUNIST FRONT

THE Communist "front" organisation, important ... country wherein the open Communist Party ... has a specially important rôle to play in Britai... has probably less chance ... the avowed Red ... country. ... than in any other major free country. ... through honourable political means and ... power are out of the question, any s... national Communism must be c... fronts, fellow-travellers, and ... especially useful and numero...

It was Otto Kuusinen ... first devised the plan ... munist influence in ... by "creating a ... smaller commu... organisation ... Party, ... but ... the ...

...ganisa... ...direction of ... very titles of n... what is their true ... be taken in by a Wor... a Society for Cultural Ku... International Association of ... is some danger that the maj... politically alert, might be impresse... tions or petitions sponsored by such bo... right that they should be exposed as widely ... and this is very well done by Transport Hou... trades union bodies and independent bodies. ... Communist Industrial Research and Informa... has recently published an admirably documented bo... *Communist Solar System*, dealing with su...

...ntern, who ... ...e range of Com... ... of Western Europe ... ...n of organisations and ... ...ommunist Party—smaller ... under the influence of the ... ...f its mechanical leadership" ... ...berg who exploited that idea t... at "we must penetrate every co... hold of artists and ... and cinemas, and spread abroad ... Russia is prepared to sacrifice everythin... considering the assortment of weapons used in ...neld by Communist subversionists, it is vital that a ... satellite...

BRITISH - AUSTRALASIAN

A NATIONAL

B.B.C. -

MENACE

...TLING THE SH...

...lly of the National Referendu... ... Hall, Red Lion Square, got ... result of the Chairman's ... ...ll and although two ... ere members of the ... been summarily refused ... when Mr. Tom Benford rose ... to his feet at the start of the proceedings to ask, on ... a point of order, for an explanation of this ban, he ... was denied any hearing despite cries of "Let him ... speak" and "Where is free speech?". When every ... effort made by the Chairman, Mr. Douglas Jay, M.P. ... to drown the ...

...TY FIGHTER...

...til question time", but h... ...s taken that advice they ... sheep got to Sister... ...las Jay promptly ...

...ver, to ask ... ... of the ... ...g in ...

...on... ...wound... The op... him what h... referendum was ... the E.B.C., to whic... I do in elections"—i... he would be perfectly hap... will of the people" and pack h...

TOMORROW

PLAN FOR BRITISH SURVIVAL

By A. K. CHESTERTON

...e eye upon the collectivising of ...se nations must be edged towards it by ...d the Communist tactic most ... Western world is the approa... which, once establi... short step to ...ing ...

LIGHT AND BITTER

MOSTLY BITTER THIS MONTH!

Communi... U.S ... ...s top ...oration with ...nisations in the ...ating committees; why ... the ranks of the anti-anti-

...e wonder, then, what the executive ...e World Council has in mind when it speaks ...aginative thinking and action of a wholly new ...uer", and transforming the "vision of social justice" into reality?

ASHES

Can... off to a ... inadequacy. ... thirds of th... National Front ... affiliation to the N.A. ...

TUCSON MEMORIAL PARK—

JEWS ORDER CEMETERY CROSSES REMOVED

Christian Patriots:

material that may be of interest to you ...rt of this material can be used in your ...ten the careless and timid Gentile race— ...lisposal.

a Reverend Butler, salesman for East ...on Memorial Park), showed us a blue-print ... Mausoleum being constructed at East ... of the walls would be of 10" x 20" marble ... then in each wall (coloured marble ... cross. ... in one of the crosses, ...

So I cancelled out and had East Lawn return ... of my money.

Then I got a call in December, 1972 telli... that everything had been straightened out ... original plan was back in effect.

... enclosure, we bought again—th... ...rowing—being finished as time ...

... on March 10th, 1974 we visited ... but we couldn't find the crosses. ... Morrison on March 12th and asked abou... He said, "I'm sorry, there won't be a... the Jewish people even want us to rem... of the GOOD SHEPHERD."

He said "they exerted an awful lo... the enclosures show, I c... ...ound my mon...

CANDOUR

Founded by A. K. Chesterton to defend National Sovereignty against the ...

Vol. XXV No. 547 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a News...*

CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

the one paper which does not hesitate to tell the blunt truth behind the news

Since it was founded in 1953 by A. K. Chesterton, *Candour*—by penetrating comment and complete fearlessness—has tirelessly exposed the internationalist attack on nationhood and sought to re-awaken in the British people at home and overseas their sense of patriotism.

As a fighting journal we have . . .

- OFFERED strenuous resistance to the surrender to barbarism and tyranny of our country's overseas responsibilities in what was once British Africa.
- STOOD resolutely and faithfully behind the upholders of White civilisation in Rhodesia and South Africa.
- STRIVEN for continuing unity between Great Britain and her kinsfolk in the White Commonwealth through an upgraded system of Imperial Preference.

Eleven years before Enoch Powell spoke out, we were warning of the imminent destruction of our Anglo-Saxon and Celtic stocks in the United Kingdom threatened by large-scale coloured immigration and integration.

Long before the scheme for Britain's enslavement in the Common Market was publicly mooted, we were warning that it was intended by international financial powers as a stepping-stone towards world government.

What other periodical can claim so continuous a record of trying to safeguard vital British interests?

What other paper has so clearly delineated the shape of things to come?

IS ANY OTHER POLITICAL JOURNAL MORE WORTHY OF YOUR SUPPORT?

Tributes to Candour . . .

" . . . a publication which is courageous and intelligent and puts forward views which are sane and opinions which are excellent."

Pierre Hofstetter, former editor Defence de L'Occident.

" Long may *Candour* proclaim the truth and uphold the tradition of British liberty."

J.H.M., Nantwich.

" We look forward to *Candour's* arrival as the only news that is reliable and up-to-date coverage of the position in Africa and the U.K."

C.C., Queensland, Australia.

" Just a line to congratulate you warmly on the last *Candour* which has just reached me. I hope your plain-speaking will pierce the hearts of some of the race-mixers, who are so disgusting in their stupidity."

the late Admiral Sir Barry Domville, London, S.W.15.

" I am particularly interested in all you publish about South Africa and Rhodesia, and am in hearty agreement with the stand you take against the foolish handling by the British Government of the whole situation."

Wm. C., Auckland, N.Z.

***Candour* is essential reading for patriots brave enough to face harsh facts and fight for Britain's national survival.**

Will YOU give it YOUR support?

Subscription rates per annum :

U.K. £~~4~~5.00; Overseas £~~4~~5.50 Airmail ; U.S. Dollar ~~10~~12.00 Airmail

Single Copy ~~30~~40p.

YES . . . I would like to subscribe to Candour

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose .....

Remittances should be made out to CANDOUR PUBLISHING Co., and sent to FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HAMPSHIRE GU33 7DD.

Donation to A.K.C. Trust .....